

RE: politic-phil: Beer

Von: **kevin galalae** (kgalalae@hotmail.com)

Gesendet: Freitag, 26. Juni 2009 08:12:35

An: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk

Hi Ivor,

I would be interested to know if Max ever answered your invitation. The reason I ask is because I have always suspected that Max is Dr. Giovanni's proxy and may not even exist as a real student. I am probably wrong, but I would love to know if that is the case. Can you help?

On a different note, I continue to enjoy your postings. I can do so because I have appealed Giovanni's decision to throw me out of the course and have asked for and was granted access to the forums to prepare my defence. As long as I do not post anything and the appeal, which is now about to go the university's proctors, is ongoing, the department of continuing education had no choice but to grant me access.

Keep up the good work.

Kevin Galalae

Date: Sun, 21 Jun 2009 22:07:13 +0100

To: kgalalae@hotmail.com

From: conted.ox@m3w5.demon.co.uk

Subject: politic-phil: Beer

[politic-phil](#) » [Forums](#) » [Common room](#) » [Beer](#)



Beer

by [Ivor Middleton](#) - Monday, 22 June 2009, 02:19 AM

Max,

You must live and work somewhere near me - fancy meeting up for a drink sometime ?
ivor_at_m3w5.demon.co.uk

Ivor

[Reply](#)

[See this post in context](#)

RE: politic-phil: Beer

Von: **kevin galalae** (kgalalae@hotmail.com)

Gesendet: Montag, 29. Juni 2009 03:36:39

An: [Ivor Middleton \(ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk\)](mailto:ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk)

Hi Ivor,

Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a

privilege I am allowed as part of my defence.

As for your question, it is not so much that my views have changed, as it is that they have been confirmed. I would love to elaborate, but I don't think you will like to hear what I have to say. You know how outspoken I am and since I don't like to beat around the bush or sugar coat my opinions it is best I keep them to myself. You saw where speaking honestly leads in an environment as inimical to free speech as Oxford.

Anyhow, thank you for taking the time to answer my email. I appreciate it. If there is anything I can do for you let me know.

Hope you had a great camping weekend with the kids. It sounds like great fun.

Take care,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk

To: kgalalae@hotmail.com

Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Date: Sat, 27 Jun 2009 17:00:08 +0100

Hi Kevin,

Yes, he is real and did reply.

Be interested to know if anything on the course has changed your views. I certainly expected to come out with some changed views.

Can't carry on, under pressure to go - camping with the kids.

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [<mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com>]

Sent: 26 June 2009 07:13

To: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk

Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,

I would be interested to know if Max ever answered your invitation. The reason I ask is

because I have always suspected that Max is Dr. Giovanni's proxy and may not even exist as a real student. I am probably wrong, but I would love to know if that is the case. Can you help?

On a different note, I continue to enjoy your postings. I can do so because I have appealed Giovanni's decision to throw me out of the course and have asked for and was granted access to the forums to prepare my defence. As long as I do not post anything and the appeal, which is now about to go the university's proctors, is ongoing, the department of continuing education had no choice but to grant me access.

Keep up the good work.

Kevin Galalae

Date: Sun, 21 Jun 2009 22:07:13 +0100

To: kgalalae@hotmail.com

From: conted.ox@m3w5.demon.co.uk

Subject: politic-phil: Beer

[politic-phil](#) » [Forums](#) » [Common room](#) » [Beer](#)



Beer

by [Ivor Middleton](#) - Monday, 22 June 2009, 02:19 AM

Max,

You must live and work somewhere near me - fancy meeting up for a drink sometime ? ivor_at_m3w5.demon.co.uk

Ivor

[Reply](#)

[See this post in context](#)

Hi Ivor,

I will write to you tonight. It is Canada Day today and I am taking my son and wife downtown to enjoy the celebrations. I think you and I can have some very interesting and productive discussions. I just want to let you know that I look forward to our long-distance dialogue.

Regards,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Wed, 1 Jul 2009 08:29:23 +0100

Hi Kevin,

I feel no anger, so you need to change the basic premiss for what you have written here.

You make some very personal attacks in what you write below, which are based upon conjecture or personal perceptions. It is extraordinarily difficult to ever know what is going on in someone else's head. Despite this, your statements suggest you have a good idea of what is going on in my head : "boiling", "publicly embarrassed", "tried to sound smart", "full of anger", concerned for my "social position", "intolerance" for other views. These are unfounded and you should not have made them. For example, I would not be discussing with you if I could not tolerate your alternative views.

As said below, I would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you. Personal attacks can wait until you have more grounds ☺

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 01 July 2009 03:23
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,

Since it pains me to see you so full of anger, I will try to help you recover your composure. By the way, thank you for reaching out to me to help you resolve your anger issues.

To help you, however, I am afraid that I will have to bluntly point out the probable underlying causes of your anger; for only by honestly facing them do you stand a chance to recover. This is a similar approach to psychoanalysis. The sources of your anger are most likely the following conscious or unconscious inner conflicts:

1. You are still boiling over having lost every debate with me and having been at times publicly embarrassed in the process (like when you tried to sound smart by mentioning chaos theory).
2. You are using misdirected anger to mask your intolerance for views critical of the society you live in, and of the ideals you conveniently espouse because they fit your social position.
3. By angrily insisting that my alleged rudeness warrants my exclusion from the course you are trying to hide your lack of courage and inability to live up to the principles you thought you hold dear; in this case, free speech. I felt very embarrassed and even ashamed for you, Giovanni and the few who engaged in the debate on liberty and freedom of speech while trying so hard to ignore the white elephant in the room. The white elephant being, obviously, the curtailment of my liberty to participate in political debates and to freely express my opinions.

I could go deeper than this, but since there is a chance that you might harm yourself, I am afraid that it would be irresponsible on my part to do so without my being in the same room as you. Take the time to systematically chew over this and if you need more help treating your anger I will lend you a hand again soon.

As for your request that I freely share with you what I have learned from the course, as long as you are emotionally compromised for one or all of the above reasons it is best you take the time to calm down before venturing beyond your comfort zone to debate serious issues with me. As you know by now, debating me is a hazardous hobby for those who are faint of heart. Furthermore, I am rather busy trying to defend my constitutional rights by appealing my

expulsion from the course. Once that is over, I will be more than happy to enlighten you on my way of thinking.

I hope this helps.

Sincerely,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Tue, 30 Jun 2009 21:36:13 +0100

Kevin,

I don't mind hearing you elaborate and I may or may not agree 😊

I think you were very rude in the forums. It is one thing to disagree and state an opinion at the other pole, but another thing altogether to make personal attacks. You made some very personal, unfounded and unnecessary remarks. They went too far. An apology and a return to the political discussions might have allowed the University to leave it be. Having dug yourself a hole, you then jumped in it by making an issue of it !

Anyhow, I am thick skinned and would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you.

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 29 June 2009 02:37
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence.
As for your question, it is not so much that my views have changed, as it is that they have been confirmed. I would love to elaborate, but I don't think you will like to hear what I have to say. You know how outspoken I am and since I don't like to beat around the bush or sugar coat my opinions it is best I keep them to myself. You saw where speaking honestly leads in an environment as inimical to free speech as Oxford.
Anyhow, thank you for taking the time to answer my email. I appreciate it. If there is anything I can do for you let me know.
Hope you had a great camping weekend with the kids. It sounds like great fun.
Take care,
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Sat, 27 Jun 2009 17:00:08 +0100

Hi Kevin,

Yes, he is real and did reply.

Be interested to know if anything on the course has changed your views. I certainly expected to come out with some changed views.

Can't carry on, under pressure to go - camping with the kids.

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 26 June 2009 07:13
To: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,

I would be interested to know if Max ever answered your invitation. The reason I ask is because I have always suspected that Max is Dr. Giovanni's proxy and may not even exist as a real student. I am probably wrong, but I would love to know if that is the case. Can you help?

On a different note, I continue to enjoy your postings. I can do so because I have appealed Giovanni's decision to throw me out of the course and have asked for and was granted access to the forums to prepare my defence. As long as I do not post anything and the appeal, which is now about to go the university's proctors, is ongoing, the department of continuing education had no choice but to grant me access.

Keep up the good work.

Kevin Galalae

Date: Sun, 21 Jun 2009 22:07:13 +0100
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
From: conted.ox@m3w5.demon.co.uk
Subject: politic-phil: Beer

[politic-phil](#) » [Forums](#) » [Common room](#) » [Beer](#)

Beer

by [Ivor Middleton](#) - Monday, 22 June 2009, 02:19 AM

Max,

You must live and work somewhere near me - fancy meeting up for a drink sometime ?
ivor_at_m3w5.demon.co.uk

Ivor

[Reply](#)

[See this post in context](#)

RE: politic-phil: Beer

Von: **kevin galalae** (kgalalae@hotmail.com)
Gesendet: Donnerstag, 2. Juli 2009 06:45:44
An: Ivor Middleton (ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk)
Dear Ivor,

It's not a premise; it's a diagnosis. Your anger obviously overpowered your sense of propriety, for though I did not solicit your opinion about what happened in the forums you could not contain your anger and had to let it loose on me in a most unseemly manner. You must know that it is very rude to accuse someone of rudeness especially when it is outside the topic of discussion.

Having detected your anger I proceeded to diagnose its cause. You are distorting my attempt at diagnosing your anger as a personal attack on you. If you applied the same distorting criticism to your oncologist, you would accuse him of molesting you for shoving his arm up your arse to ascertain whether the symptoms you display are indeed caused by a malignant tumour that is threatening your life with colon cancer. By the same token, you would call the cops on the nurse who is drawing your blood for necessary lab tests, for you would accuse her of vampirism.

What I did is to merely point out the most probable causes of your anger. If I had been wrong in my diagnosis, you would have no doubt proceeded to set me right on the subject by volunteering the true cause or causes of your anger. But instead you chose to deny that you are angry at all, despite the fact that this is an obvious lie. And bare denial, as we all know, is the natural defence of all those who try to hide the truth. So before we can proceed to philosophical discussions you must at least admit that you are emotionally compromised and tell me why. That way we can set the record straight and pave the way for logical and honest dialogue. Otherwise we would engage each other on false premises and will only end up aggravating each other. Life is too short for aggravation.

It is interesting to note that in re-reading your emails I could not help but stumble upon a different thread. Since I am an honest man who likes to play with all cards on the table, I will reveal to you my revelation.

Your answer to my question whether Max is real and answered your invitation to a beer brought about your reply that *"Yes, he is real and did reply."* But since you did not meet him for a beer you have no way of knowing that the person who replied to your email is Max or not. Nevertheless, you declare with great certainty that Max is real. In and of itself there is nothing suspicious in your answer. But the anger that followed my reply (*"Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence."*) is what aroused my suspicion. My answer was obviously not to your liking. Yet the forcefulness with which you expressed your dissatisfaction with my resolve to defend myself goes well beyond what would be appropriate and therefore normal for someone who is uninvolved in the matter. This leads me to believe that you are somehow personally involved. Could it be that you are trying to cover up Max's true identity in order to protect Giovanni? If so, that would mean that you are privy to information that Giovanni would only share with someone he knows well or someone who shares a secret with him. It could also very well be that I have uncovered the axis of conniving that brought about my expulsion from the course.

The suspicion that you are privy to information that only Giovanni has received from me is supported also by your echoing of the language I used in my appeal to the adjudicator to list Gloria's insults directed at me. Revealing is also the fact that you are using the same rationale and language as Giovanni to insinuate that my expulsion from the course is not a case of curtailment of free speech but a case of the right punishment for someone who makes personal attacks on others. When all of the above threads are put together it becomes clear that you and Giovanni have direct contact and that the two of you have exchanged information that a tutor and a student have no reason to exchange unless they are collaborators or, should I say, partners in crime.

If that is the case, you better come clear, Ivor; otherwise Giovanni will lose his job when all this information comes into the hands of the Proctors. And I certainly don't want Giovanni to lose his job. I like Giovanni and think he is a decent guy who made a big mistake in choosing to maliciously deny me credit for the course and for breeching my right to free speech and to expressing my socio-political ideas and ideals without fear of retribution.

Furthermore, anyone with half a brain looking at Max's debate with me will know that the person debating me is not a student but the course's tutor. Giovanni's continuous denial of this fact places him in a very dangerous position.

Let me show you how easy it is to show that Max is Giovanni:

1. Max has only posted twice, for Plato's argument, lesson five, and political experiences, lesson 1. A student as intelligent as Max would not take the course to fail it due to laziness or failure to fulfill the course requirements.
2. Max has a wonderfully clear mind and a keen intellect, which he uses to clarify the information posted by others in order to bring maximum benefit to the class. A student would not summarize the opponent's points with such selfless clarity or post with the intent to complete the existing discussion.
3. Max's first lengthy posting comes right after Giovanni's intervention in lesson 4, when his defence of utilitarianism in the objections to utilitarianism forum, lesson 4, backfired in that it stifled further debate. Giovanni was obviously trying a new strategy to direct the discussion by posting under an assumed identity.
4. Only Giovanni uses multiple emoticons within a single posting. Max, like Giovanni, uses multiple emoticons.
5. Only a tutor and not a student would be concerned with deviating from the course topic. A student as disinterested in the course as Max would certainly not show this kind of concern.
6. Max Tant has disappeared from the forums as suddenly as he appeared.
7. Max Tant has engaged no one but me.
8. Once I voiced my suspicion to Giovanni about Max's true identity, Max disappeared from the forums entirely.

So you see, my dear Ivor, it is painfully obvious that Max is Giovanni. What is unclear is why Giovanni used Max as a proxy? What is also clear is that the whooping I gave Max in the debate would have certainly upset Giovanni by hurting his pride. As you well know, nobody likes to lose a debate. For a tutor to lose a debate to a student must be especially unbearable. Ergo, Giovanni kicked me out of the course for ulterior motives. Ergo two, in denying that he is behind Max's postings he is allowing himself the right to lie and to call me an anarchist and a communist under an assumed identity while denying me the right to self-defence to Gloria's attempt at scapegoating me for her inability to keep up with the course work.

Well, I am burning to hear your reply.

Cheerio mate,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Wed, 1 Jul 2009 08:29:23 +0100

Hi Kevin,

I feel no anger, so you need to change the basic premiss for what you have written here.

You make some very personal attacks in what you write below, which are based upon conjecture or personal perceptions. It is extraordinarily difficult to ever know what is going on in someone else's head. Despite this, your statements suggest you have a good idea of what is going on in my head : "boiling", "publicly embarrassed", "tried to sound smart", "full of anger", concerned for my "social position", "intolerance" for other views. These are unfounded and you should not have made them. For example, I would not be discussing with you if I could not tolerate your alternative views.

As said below, I would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you. Personal attacks can wait until you have more grounds ☺

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]

Sent: 01 July 2009 03:23

To: Ivor Middleton

Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,

Since it pains me to see you so full of anger, I will try to help you recover your composure. By the way, thank you for reaching out to me to help you resolve your anger issues.

To help you, however, I am afraid that I will have to bluntly point out the probable underlying causes of your anger; for only by honestly facing them do you stand a chance to recover. This is a similar approach to psychoanalysis. The sources of your anger are most likely the following conscious or unconscious inner conflicts:

1. You are still boiling over having lost every debate with me and having been at times publicly embarrassed in the process (like when you tried to sound smart by mentioning chaos theory).
2. You are using misdirected anger to mask your intolerance for views critical of the society you live in, and of the ideals you conveniently espouse because they fit your social position.
3. By angrily insisting that my alleged rudeness warrants my exclusion from the course you are trying to hide your lack of courage and inability to live up to the principles you thought you hold dear; in this case, free speech. I felt very embarrassed and even ashamed for you, Giovanni and the few who engaged in the debate on liberty and freedom of speech while trying so hard to ignore the white elephant in the room. The white elephant being, obviously, the curtailment of my liberty to participate in political debates and to freely express my opinions.

I could go deeper than this, but since there is a chance that you might harm yourself, I am afraid that it would be irresponsible on my part to do so without my being in the same room as you. Take the time to systematically chew over this and if you need more help treating your anger I will lend you a hand again soon.

As for your request that I freely share with you what I have learned from the course, as long as you are emotionally compromised for one or all of the above reasons it is best you take the time to calm down before venturing beyond your comfort zone to debate serious issues with me. As you know by now, debating me is a hazardous hobby for those who are faint of heart. Furthermore, I am rather busy trying to defend my constitutional rights by appealing my expulsion from the course. Once that is over, I will be more than happy to enlighten you on my way of thinking.

I hope this helps.

Sincerely,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Tue, 30 Jun 2009 21:36:13 +0100

Kevin,

I don't mind hearing you elaborate and I may or may not agree ☺

I think you were very rude in the forums. It is one thing to disagree and state an opinion at the other pole, but another thing altogether to make personal attacks. You made some very personal, unfounded and unnecessary remarks. They went too far. An apology and a return to the political discussions might have allowed the University to leave it be. Having dug yourself a hole, you then jumped in it by making an issue of it !

Anyhow, I am thick skinned and would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you.

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 29 June 2009 02:37
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence.
As for your question, it is not so much that my views have changed, as it is that they have been confirmed. I would love to elaborate, but I don't think you will like to hear what I have to say. You know how outspoken I am and since I don't like to beat around the bush or sugar coat my opinions it is best I keep them to myself. You saw where speaking honestly leads in an environment as inimical to free speech as Oxford.
Anyhow, thank you for taking the time to answer my email. I appreciate it. If there is anything I can do for you let me know.
Hope you had a great camping weekend with the kids. It sounds like great fun.
Take care,
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Sat, 27 Jun 2009 17:00:08 +0100

Hi Kevin,

Yes, he is real and did reply.

Be interested to know if anything on the course has changed your views. I certainly expected to come out with some changed views.

Can't carry on, under pressure to go - camping with the kids.

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 26 June 2009 07:13
To: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,

I would be interested to know if Max ever answered your invitation. The reason I ask is because I have always suspected that Max is Dr. Giovanni's proxy and may not even exist as a real student. I am probably wrong, but I would love to know if that is the case. Can you help?

On a different note, I continue to enjoy your postings. I can do so because I have appealed Giovanni's decision to throw me out of the course and have asked for and was granted access to the forums to prepare my defence. As long as I do not post anything and the appeal, which is now about to go the university's proctors, is ongoing, the department of continuing education had no choice but to grant me access.

Keep up the good work.

Kevin Galalae

Date: Sun, 21 Jun 2009 22:07:13 +0100
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
From: conted.ox@m3w5.demon.co.uk
Subject: politic-phil: Beer

[politic-phil](#) » [Forums](#) » [Common room](#) » [Beer](#)

Beer

by [Ivor Middleton](#) - Monday, 22 June 2009, 02:19 AM

Max,

You must live and work somewhere near me - fancy meeting up for a drink sometime ?
ivor_at_m3w5.demon.co.uk

Ivor

[Reply](#)

[See this post in context](#)

RE: politic-phil: Beer

Von: **kevin galalae** (kgalalae@hotmail.com)
Gesendet: Donnerstag, 2. Juli 2009 16:18:20
An: Ivor Middleton (ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk)
It's a bitch when you bite your own hook, isn't it, Ivor?

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Wed, 1 Jul 2009 08:29:23 +0100

Hi Kevin,

I feel no anger, so you need to change the basic premiss for what you have written here.

You make some very personal attacks in what you write below, which are based upon conjecture or personal perceptions. It is extraordinarily difficult to ever know what is going on in someone else's head. Despite this, your statements suggest you have a good idea of what is going on in my head : "boiling", "publicly embarrassed", "tried to sound smart", "full of anger", concerned for my "social position", "intolerance" for other views. These are unfounded and you should not have made them. For example, I would not be discussing with you if I could not tolerate your alternative views.

As said below, I would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you. Personal attacks can wait until you have more grounds ☺

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]

Sent: 01 July 2009 03:23

To: Ivor Middleton

Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,

Since it pains me to see you so full of anger, I will try to help you recover your composure. By the way, thank you for reaching out to me to help you resolve your anger issues.

To help you, however, I am afraid that I will have to bluntly point out the probable underlying causes of your anger; for only by honestly facing them do you stand a chance to recover. This is a similar approach to psychoanalysis. The sources of your anger are most likely the following conscious or unconscious inner conflicts:

1. You are still boiling over having lost every debate with me and having been at times publicly embarrassed in the process (like when you tried to sound smart by mentioning chaos theory).
2. You are using misdirected anger to mask your intolerance for views critical of the society you live in, and of the ideals you conveniently espouse because they fit your social position.
3. By angrily insisting that my alleged rudeness warrants my exclusion from the course you are trying to hide your lack of courage and inability to live up to the principles you thought you hold dear; in this case, free speech. I felt very embarrassed and even ashamed for you, Giovanni and the few who engaged in the debate on liberty and freedom of speech while trying so hard to ignore the white elephant in the room. The white elephant being, obviously, the curtailment of my liberty to participate in political debates and to freely express my opinions.

I could go deeper than this, but since there is a chance that you might harm yourself, I am afraid that it would be irresponsible on my part to do so without my being in the same room as you. Take the time to systematically chew over this and if you need more help treating your anger I will lend you a hand again soon.

As for your request that I freely share with you what I have learned from the course, as long as you are emotionally compromised for one or all of the above reasons it is best you take the time to calm down before venturing beyond your comfort zone to debate serious issues with me. As you know by now, debating me is a hazardous hobby for those who are faint of heart. Furthermore, I am rather busy trying to defend my constitutional rights by appealing my expulsion from the course. Once that is over, I will be more than happy to enlighten you on my way of thinking.

I hope this helps.

Sincerely,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Tue, 30 Jun 2009 21:36:13 +0100

Kevin,

I don't mind hearing you elaborate and I may or may not agree ☺

I think you were very rude in the forums. It is one thing to disagree and state an opinion at the other pole, but another thing altogether to make personal attacks. You made some very personal, unfounded and unnecessary remarks. They went too far. An apology and a return to the political discussions might have allowed the University to leave it be. Having dug yourself a hole, you then jumped in it by making an issue of it !

Anyhow, I am thick skinned and would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you.

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 29 June 2009 02:37
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence.
As for your question, it is not so much that my views have changed, as it is that they have been confirmed. I would love to elaborate, but I don't think you will like to hear what I have to say. You know how outspoken I am and since I don't like to beat around the bush or sugar coat my opinions it is best I keep them to myself. You saw where speaking honestly leads in an environment as inimical to free speech as Oxford.
Anyhow, thank you for taking the time to answer my email. I appreciate it. If there is anything I can do for you let me know.
Hope you had a great camping weekend with the kids. It sounds like great fun.
Take care,
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Sat, 27 Jun 2009 17:00:08 +0100

Hi Kevin,

Yes, he is real and did reply.

Be interested to know if anything on the course has changed your views. I certainly expected to come out with some changed views.

Can't carry on, under pressure to go - camping with the kids.

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 26 June 2009 07:13
To: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
I would be interested to know if Max ever answered your invitation. The reason I ask is because I have always suspected that Max is Dr. Giovanni's proxy and may not even exist as a real student. I am probably wrong, but I would love to know if that is the case. Can you help?
On a different note, I continue to enjoy your postings. I can do so because I have appealed Giovanni's decision to throw me out of the course and have asked for and was granted access to the forums to prepare my defence. As long as I do not post anything and the appeal, which is now about to go the university's proctors, is ongoing, the department of continuing education had no choice but to grant me access.
Keep up the good work.
Kevin Galalae

Date: Sun, 21 Jun 2009 22:07:13 +0100
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
From: conted.ox@m3w5.demon.co.uk
Subject: politic-phil: Beer

[politic-phil](#) » [Forums](#) » [Common room](#) » [Beer](#)

Beer

by [Ivor Middleton](#) - Monday, 22 June 2009, 02:19 AM

Max,

You must live and work somewhere near me - fancy meeting up for a drink sometime ?
ivor _at_ m3w5.demon.co.uk

Ivor

[Reply](#)

[See this post in context](#)

RE: politic-phil: Beer

Von: **kevin galalae** (kgalalae@hotmail.com)
Gesendet: Sonntag, 5. Juli 2009 07:18:17
An: Ivor Middleton (ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk)
1 Anlage
[what I ha...doc](#) (34,5 KB)

Dear Ivor,
Read the attachment for help with your assignment.
Kevin

This is what I have learned (in addition to having become familiar with a few thinkers I did not previously have the time to study).

1. **That the philosophical underpinnings of every society have a great bearing on its nature**, which is why Great Britain is Hobbesian and France is Rousseauan. In turn, the people who are raised in a particular society exhibit the inclinations and prejudices of that particular society, as shaped by its philosophical underpinnings. This became visible when we discussed the nature of primitive man in a state of nature. Those who were from Latin countries, we saw, were more likely to support Rousseau's view while those from England by and large agreed with Hobbes.
2. **That most people are utterly incapable of living up to the ideals they profess**, and that while they can espouse them with various degrees of eloquence and theoretical conviction in academic discussions that cost nothing in terms of personal risk, they fail far short when it is

time to apply them in real life situations and in the process stick out their necks purely on principle. We saw how a clear example of curtailment of free speech elicited no objections from any of the people in the course and that while some felt too uncomfortable to participate in the discussion about liberty and freedom of speech, having the good sense to recognize the contradiction, others, made complete asses of themselves when they proceeded to vent lofty thoughts about liberty and free speech while failing to raise a single question or objection about an egregious example of free speech curtailment. It appears that I was the only one who stood up not only for my own freedom of speech and the right to self-defence, but also for that of Gloria's. But then again, I hold myself to higher standards, which is why I am out of the course. Most human beings find nothing more offensive than an honest and courageous man among them.

The Hobbesians among us might say that this proves Hobbes was right in having such a dismal view of mankind. I retort that what this proves is that my assessment of human nature is more accurate than that of Hobbes, for while he posited that all men resort to violence in the absence of a higher authority I maintain that they resort to cowardice. It also proves that representative democracies prevent men from emancipating to a higher stage of development.

3. **That the way Giovanni (and his cohorts at the Department of Continuing Education) dealt with me offends many of the dearest principles he teaches:**

a. Mill's Liberty Principle

Mill "was determined that the sphere of liberty was not to be left to the 'likings and dislikings' of society. So it is obvious that he must distinguish between those actions which society, or its members, dislike, or find annoying or offensive, and those actions which cause harm. Mere offence, or dislike, for Mill, is no harm." (Wolff, p. 113)

b. Mill on freedom of thought

"The first thing to note, for Mill, is that the fact a view is unpopular is no reason at all to silence it: "If all mankind minus one were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind' (On Liberty, 142, quoted by Wolff, p. 107)."

c. Rousseau's model of participatory democracy

Where respect for the individual, for debate, and for minority views are protected. It was interesting to see how the people in the course were afraid to answer my question of whether they thought I should be allowed to speak freely or be silenced. Instead they waited for Giovanni and thus robbed themselves of testing to see how direct democracy would have solved the conflict between the party of the malcontent and me. I would still

like to know, but Giovanni denied us the opportunity to put my Universal Equalizer Principle to the test. Instead he showed us just how poorly the hierarchical authorities of representative democracies work when it comes to upholding the most sacred values of democracy (freedom of speech, liberty to engage in political debate, immunity against victimization, etc.) and minority views.

4. **That most Westerners** (and Giovanni, despite his training, is no exception) **merely pay lip service to intellectual freedom and tolerance of diverse beliefs and values, but actually subscribe to a narrow form of moral relativism** that reflects their post-modern indifference and lack of convictions of any kind other than economic self-interest. This, coupled with an exaggerated form of political correctness and the circumscribing notion that politeness must come before clarity and truth, does more to inhibit freedom of thought and free speech than communist censorship could have ever achieved. As a result, reason is the first victim and justice the last.

The reason for this intellectual and moral lassitude, I believe, is that Westerners refuse to be allowed to be challenged and so only hear themselves speak and think. As a result, to paraphrase Mill once again, the real meaning of their convictions has been lost or has been so enfeebled by lack of internal and external challenges and, because they have not had to defend the ideas and ideals they have inherited, their views have been 'deprived of [their] vital effect on the character and conduct, the dogma becoming a mere formal profession, inefficacious for good' (On Liberty, 181, quoted by Wolff, pp. 110-111).

5. **That entertaining ideas purely as intellectual exercises is a waste of time unless one is willing to subject them to the stresses and abuses of the real world.** Only bitter experience and the clash of wills can burn ideas and ideals into the human psyche so that they become an indissoluble part of one's being. A virtual course is a great environment for ideas to be subjected to this kind of test, but the existing restrictions of netiquette take away an online course's greatest asset. Bad ideas are like weeds. To uproot them one must reach down to the cerebral cortex and yank them out violently. Shaking the leaves at the top will do nothing more than strengthen the weed's stock. Giovanni's course does nothing more than to promote dead dogmas instead of to uphold living truths, because he does not have the courage to allow students to fearlessly challenge each other.

As Mill says, we 'go to sleep at [the] post as soon as there is no enemy in the field' (On Liberty, 170, quoted by Wolff, p. 110).

6. **That reconciling freedom and equality is the greatest challenge of social organization** and that capitalism and representative forms of democracy stand in the way of making progress on this count.

That's 1140 words. I hope it helps you with your assignment. Sorry that most of the lessons are negative ones. Nevertheless, negative lessons are just as valuable as positive ones if you know what to do with them. I hope you do.

Now it's your turn to enlighten me.

Regards,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Fri, 3 Jul 2009 11:29:29 +0100

Kevin,

I feel no anger so , premise or diagnosis, the case needs to be rethought.

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 02 July 2009 05:46
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,

It's not a premise; it's a diagnosis. Your anger obviously overpowered your sense of propriety, for though I did not solicit your opinion about what happened in the forums you could not contain your anger and had to let it loose on me in a most unseemly manner. You must know that it is very rude to accuse someone of rudeness especially when it is outside the topic of discussion.

Having detected your anger I proceeded to diagnose its cause. You are distorting my attempt at diagnosing your anger as a personal attack on you. If you applied the same distorting criticism to your oncologist, you would accuse him of molesting you for shoving his arm up your arse to ascertain whether the symptoms you display are indeed caused by a malignant tumour that is threatening your life with colon cancer. By the same token, you would call the cops on the nurse who is drawing your blood for necessary lab tests, for you would accuse her of vampirism.

What I did is to merely point out the most probable causes of your anger. If I had been wrong in my diagnosis, you would have no doubt proceeded to set me right on the subject by volunteering the true cause or causes of your anger. But instead you chose to deny that you are angry at all, despite the fact that this is an obvious lie. And bare denial, as we all know, is the natural defence of all those who try to hide the truth. So before we can proceed to philosophical discussions you must at least admit that you are emotionally compromised and tell me why. That way we can set the record straight and pave the way for logical and honest dialogue. Otherwise we would engage each other on false premises and will only end up aggravating each other. Life is too short for aggravation.

It is interesting to note that in re-reading your emails I could not help but stumble upon a different thread. Since I am an honest man who likes to play with all cards on the table, I will reveal to you my revelation.

Your answer to my question whether Max is real and answered your invitation to a beer brought about your reply that *"Yes, he is real and did reply."* But since you did not meet him for a beer you have no way of knowing that the person who replied to your email is Max or not. Nevertheless, you declare with great certainty that Max is real. In and of itself there is nothing suspicious in your answer. But the anger that followed my reply (*"Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence."*) is what aroused my suspicion. My answer was obviously not to your liking. Yet the forcefulness with which you expressed your dissatisfaction with my resolve to defend myself goes well beyond what would be appropriate and therefore normal for someone who is uninvolved in the matter. This leads me to believe that you are somehow personally involved. Could it be that you are trying to cover up Max's true identity in order to protect

Giovanni? If so, that would mean that you are privy to information that Giovanni would only share with someone he knows well or someone who shares a secret with him. It could also very well be that I have uncovered the axis of conniving that brought about my expulsion from the course.

The suspicion that you are privy to information that only Giovanni has received from me is supported also by your echoing of the language I used in my appeal to the adjudicator to list Gloria's insults directed at me. Revealing is also the fact that you are using the same rationale and language as Giovanni to insinuate that my expulsion from the course is not a case of curtailment of free speech but a case of the right punishment for someone who makes personal attacks on others. When all of the above threads are put together it becomes clear that you and Giovanni have direct contact and that the two of you have exchanged information that a tutor and a student have no reason to exchange unless they are collaborators or, should I say, partners in crime.

If that is the case, you better come clear, Ivor; otherwise Giovanni will lose his job when all this information comes into the hands of the Proctors. And I certainly don't want Giovanni to lose his job. I like Giovanni and think he is a decent guy who made a big mistake in choosing to maliciously deny me credit for the course and for breeching my right to free speech and to expressing my socio-political ideas and ideals without fear of retribution.

Furthermore, anyone with half a brain looking at Max's debate with me will know that the person debating me is not a student but the course's tutor. Giovanni's continuous denial of this fact places him in a very dangerous position.

Let me show you how easy it is to show that Max is Giovanni:

1. Max has only posted twice, for Plato's argument, lesson five, and political experiences, lesson 1. A student as intelligent as Max would not take the course to fail it due to laziness or failure to fulfill the course requirements.
2. Max has a wonderfully clear mind and a keen intellect, which he uses to clarify the information posted by others in order to bring maximum benefit to the class. A student would not summarize the opponent's points with such selfless clarity or post with the intent to complete the existing discussion.
3. Max's first lengthy posting comes right after Giovanni's intervention in lesson 4, when his defence of utilitarianism in the objections to utilitarianism forum, lesson 4, backfired in that it stifled further debate. Giovanni was obviously trying a new strategy to direct the discussion by posting under an assumed identity.

4. Only Giovanni uses multiple emoticons within a single posting. Max, like Giovanni, uses multiple emoticons.
5. Only a tutor and not a student would be concerned with deviating from the course topic. A student as disinterested in the course as Max would certainly not show this kind of concern.
6. Max Tant has disappeared from the forums as suddenly as he appeared.
7. Max Tant has engaged no one but me.
8. Once I voiced my suspicion to Giovanni about Max's true identity, Max disappeared from the forums entirely.

So you see, my dear Ivor, it is painfully obvious that Max is Giovanni. What is unclear is why Giovanni used Max as a proxy? What is also clear is that the whooping I gave Max in the debate would have certainly upset Giovanni by hurting his pride. As you well know, nobody likes to lose a debate. For a tutor to lose a debate to a student must be especially unbearable. Ergo, Giovanni kicked me out of the course for ulterior motives. Ergo two, in denying that he is behind Max's postings he is allowing himself the right to lie and to call me an anarchist and a communist under an assumed identity while denying me the right to self-defence to Gloria's attempt at scapegoating me for her inability to keep up with the course work.

Well, I am burning to hear your reply.

Cheerio mate,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Wed, 1 Jul 2009 08:29:23 +0100

Hi Kevin,

I feel no anger, so you need to change the basic premiss for what you have written here.

You make some very personal attacks in what you write below, which are based upon conjecture or personal perceptions. It is extraordinarily difficult to ever know what is going on in someone else's head. Despite this, your statements suggest you have a good idea of what is going on in my head : "boiling", "publicly embarrassed", "tried to sound smart", "full of anger", concerned for my "social position", "intolerance" for other views. These are unfounded and you should not have made them. For example, I would not be discussing with you if I could not tolerate your alternative views.

As said below, I would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you. Personal attacks can wait until you have more grounds ☺

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 01 July 2009 03:23
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,

Since it pains me to see you so full of anger, I will try to help you recover your composure. By the way, thank you for reaching out to me to help you resolve your anger issues.

To help you, however, I am afraid that I will have to bluntly point out the probable underlying causes of your anger; for only by honestly facing them do you stand a chance to recover. This is a similar approach to psychoanalysis. The sources of your anger are most likely the following conscious or unconscious inner conflicts:

1. You are still boiling over having lost every debate with me and having been at times publicly embarrassed in the process (like when you tried to sound smart by mentioning chaos theory).
2. You are using misdirected anger to mask your intolerance for views critical of the society you live in, and of the ideals you conveniently espouse because they fit your social position.

3. By angrily insisting that my alleged rudeness warrants my exclusion from the course you are trying to hide your lack of courage and inability to live up to the principles you thought you hold dear; in this case, free speech. I felt very embarrassed and even ashamed for you, Giovanni and the few who engaged in the debate on liberty and freedom of speech while trying so hard to ignore the white elephant in the room. The white elephant being, obviously, the curtailment of my liberty to participate in political debates and to freely express my opinions.

I could go deeper than this, but since there is a chance that you might harm yourself, I am afraid that it would be irresponsible on my part to do so without my being in the same room as you. Take the time to systematically chew over this and if you need more help treating your anger I will lend you a hand again soon.

As for your request that I freely share with you what I have learned from the course, as long as you are emotionally compromised for one or all of the above reasons it is best you take the time to calm down before venturing beyond your comfort zone to debate serious issues with me. As you know by now, debating me is a hazardous hobby for those who are faint of heart. Furthermore, I am rather busy trying to defend my constitutional rights by appealing my expulsion from the course. Once that is over, I will be more than happy to enlighten you on my way of thinking.

I hope this helps.

Sincerely,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Tue, 30 Jun 2009 21:36:13 +0100

Kevin,

I don't mind hearing you elaborate and I may or may not agree 😊

I think you were very rude in the forums. It is one thing to disagree and state an opinion at the other pole, but another thing altogether to make personal attacks. You made some very personal, unfounded and unnecessary remarks. They went too far. An apology and a return to the political discussions might have allowed the University to leave it be. Having dug yourself a hole, you then jumped in it by making an issue of it !

Anyhow, I am thick skinned and would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you.

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 29 June 2009 02:37
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence.
As for your question, it is not so much that my views have changed, as it is that they have been confirmed. I would love to elaborate, but I don't think you will like to hear what I have to say. You know how outspoken I am and since I don't like to beat around the bush or sugar coat my opinions it is best I keep them to myself. You saw where speaking honestly leads in an environment as inimical to free speech as Oxford.
Anyhow, thank you for taking the time to answer my email. I appreciate it. If there is anything I can do for you let me know.
Hope you had a great camping weekend with the kids. It sounds like great fun.
Take care,
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com

Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Sat, 27 Jun 2009 17:00:08 +0100

Hi Kevin,

Yes, he is real and did reply.

Be interested to know if anything on the course has changed your views. I certainly expected to come out with some changed views.

Can't carry on, under pressure to go - camping with the kids.

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 26 June 2009 07:13
To: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
I would be interested to know if Max ever answered your invitation. The reason I ask is because I have always suspected that Max is Dr. Giovanni's proxy and may not even exist as a real student. I am probably wrong, but I would love to know if that is the case. Can you help?
On a different note, I continue to enjoy your postings. I can do so because I have appealed Giovanni's decision to throw me out of the course and have asked for and was granted access to the forums to prepare my defence. As long as I do not post anything and the appeal, which is now about to go the university's proctors, is ongoing, the department of continuing education had no choice but to grant me access.
Keep up the good work.
Kevin Galalae

Date: Sun, 21 Jun 2009 22:07:13 +0100
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
From: conted.ox@m3w5.demon.co.uk
Subject: politic-phil: Beer

[politic-phil](#) » [Forums](#) » [Common room](#) » [Beer](#)

Beer

by [Ivor Middleton](#) - Monday, 22 June 2009, 02:19 AM

Max,

You must live and work somewhere near me - fancy meeting up for a drink sometime ?
ivor_at_m3w5.demon.co.uk

Ivor

[Reply](#)

[See this post in context](#)

RE: politic-phil: Beer

Von: **kevin galalae** (kgalalae@hotmail.com)
Gesendet: Samstag, 4. Juli 2009 16:44:54
An: Ivor Middleton (ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk)

Very well then, Ivor, I will give you the benefit of the doubt and will help you complete your 1000 word assignment on time for the Monday deadline. But remember that dialogue is a two way street and while I am generous this time by volunteering information despite your lack your recipocation, this will not happen again in the future.

I will throughout the day think about what I have learned from the course and tonight, when I sit down at my desk to work, as I usually do, I will email you my thoughts. Hopefully, you will find them useful.

By the way, I like the way you have been handling yourself so far. You are the kind of guy I can have a serious talk with.

Regards,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Fri, 3 Jul 2009 11:29:29 +0100

Kevin,

I feel no anger so , premise or diagnosis, the case needs to be rethought.

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 02 July 2009 05:46
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,

It's not a premise; it's a diagnosis. Your anger obviously overpowered your sense of propriety, for though I did not solicit your opinion about what happened in the forums you could not contain your anger and had to let it loose on me in a most unseemly manner. You must know that it is very rude to accuse someone of rudeness especially when it is outside the topic of discussion.

Having detected your anger I proceeded to diagnose its cause. You are distorting my attempt at diagnosing your anger as a personal attack on you. If you applied the same distorting criticism to your oncologist, you would accuse him of molesting you for shoving his arm up your arse to ascertain whether the symptoms you display are indeed caused by a malignant tumour that is threatening your life with colon cancer. By the same token, you would call the cops on the nurse who is drawing your blood for necessary lab tests, for you would accuse her of vampirism.

What I did is to merely point out the most probable causes of your anger. If I had been wrong in my diagnosis, you would have no doubt proceeded to set me right on the subject by volunteering the true cause or causes of your anger. But instead you chose to deny that you are angry at all, despite the fact that this is an obvious lie. And bare denial, as we all know, is the natural defence of all those who try to hide the truth. So before we can proceed to philosophical discussions you must at least admit that you are emotionally compromised and tell me why. That way we can set the record straight and pave the way for logical and honest dialogue. Otherwise we would engage each other on false premises and will only end up aggravating each other. Life is too short for aggravation.

It is interesting to note that in re-reading your emails I could not help but stumble upon a different thread. Since I am an honest man who likes to play with all cards on the table, I will reveal to you my revelation.

Your answer to my question whether Max is real and answered your invitation to a beer brought about your reply that *"Yes, he is real and did reply."* But since you did not meet him for a beer you have no way of knowing that the person who replied to your email is Max or not. Nevertheless, you declare with great certainty that Max is real. In and of itself there is nothing suspicious in your answer. But the anger that followed my reply (*"Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence."*) is what aroused my suspicion. My answer was obviously not to your liking. Yet the forcefulness with which you expressed your dissatisfaction with my resolve to defend myself goes well beyond what would be appropriate and therefore normal for someone who is uninvolved in the matter. This leads me to believe that you are somehow personally involved. Could it be that you are trying to cover up Max's true identity in order to protect Giovanni? If so, that would mean that you are privy to information that Giovanni would only share with someone he knows well or someone who shares a secret with him. It could also very

well be that I have uncovered the axis of conniving that brought about my expulsion from the course.

The suspicion that you are privy to information that only Giovanni has received from me is supported also by your echoing of the language I used in my appeal to the adjudicator to list Gloria's insults directed at me. Revealing is also the fact that you are using the same rationale and language as Giovanni to insinuate that my expulsion from the course is not a case of curtailment of free speech but a case of the right punishment for someone who makes personal attacks on others. When all of the above threads are put together it becomes clear that you and Giovanni have direct contact and that the two of you have exchanged information that a tutor and a student have no reason to exchange unless they are collaborators or, should I say, partners in crime.

If that is the case, you better come clear, Ivor; otherwise Giovanni will lose his job when all this information comes into the hands of the Proctors. And I certainly don't want Giovanni to lose his job. I like Giovanni and think he is a decent guy who made a big mistake in choosing to maliciously deny me credit for the course and for breeching my right to free speech and to expressing my socio-political ideas and ideals without fear of retribution.

Furthermore, anyone with half a brain looking at Max's debate with me will know that the person debating me is not a student but the course's tutor. Giovanni's continuous denial of this fact places him in a very dangerous position.

Let me show you how easy it is to show that Max is Giovanni:

1. Max has only posted twice, for Plato's argument, lesson five, and political experiences, lesson 1. A student as intelligent as Max would not take the course to fail it due to laziness or failure to fulfill the course requirements.
2. Max has a wonderfully clear mind and a keen intellect, which he uses to clarify the information posted by others in order to bring maximum benefit to the class. A student would not summarize the opponent's points with such selfless clarity or post with the intent to complete the existing discussion.
3. Max's first lengthy posting comes right after Giovanni's intervention in lesson 4, when his defence of utilitarianism in the objections to utilitarianism forum, lesson 4, backfired in that it stifled further debate. Giovanni was obviously trying a new strategy to direct the discussion by posting under an assumed identity.
4. Only Giovanni uses multiple emoticons within a single posting. Max, like Giovanni, uses multiple emoticons.

5. Only a tutor and not a student would be concerned with deviating from the course topic. A student as disinterested in the course as Max would certainly not show this kind of concern.
6. Max Tant has disappeared from the forums as suddenly as he appeared.
7. Max Tant has engaged no one but me.
8. Once I voiced my suspicion to Giovanni about Max's true identity, Max disappeared from the forums entirely.

So you see, my dear Ivor, it is painfully obvious that Max is Giovanni. What is unclear is why Giovanni used Max as a proxy? What is also clear is that the whooping I gave Max in the debate would have certainly upset Giovanni by hurting his pride. As you well know, nobody likes to lose a debate. For a tutor to lose a debate to a student must be especially unbearable. Ergo, Giovanni kicked me out of the course for ulterior motives. Ergo two, in denying that he is behind Max's postings he is allowing himself the right to lie and to call me an anarchist and a communist under an assumed identity while denying me the right to self-defence to Gloria's attempt at scapegoating me for her inability to keep up with the course work.

Well, I am burning to hear your reply.

Cheerio mate,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Wed, 1 Jul 2009 08:29:23 +0100

Hi Kevin,

I feel no anger, so you need to change the basic premiss for what you have written here.

You make some very personal attacks in what you write below, which are based upon conjecture or personal perceptions. It is extraordinarily difficult to ever know what is going on in someone else's head.

Despite this, your statements suggest you have a good idea of what is going on in my head :”boiling”, “publicly embarrassed”, “tried to sound smart” , “full of anger”, concerned for my “social position”, “intolerance” for other views. These are unfounded and you should not have made them. For example, I would not be discussing with you if I could not tolerate your alternative views.

As said below, I would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you. Personal attacks can wait until you have more grounds ☺

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]

Sent: 01 July 2009 03:23

To: Ivor Middleton

Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,

Since it pains me to see you so full of anger, I will try to help you recover your composure. By the way, thank you for reaching out to me to help you resolve your anger issues.

To help you, however, I am afraid that I will have to bluntly point out the probable underlying causes of your anger; for only by honestly facing them do you stand a chance to recover. This is a similar approach to psychoanalysis. The sources of your anger are most likely the following conscious or unconscious inner conflicts:

1. You are still boiling over having lost every debate with me and having been at times publicly embarrassed in the process (like when you tried to sound smart by mentioning chaos theory).
2. You are using misdirected anger to mask your intolerance for views critical of the society you live in, and of the ideals you conveniently espouse because they fit your social position.

3. By angrily insisting that my alleged rudeness warrants my exclusion from the course you are trying to hide your lack of courage and inability to live up to the principles you thought you hold dear; in this case, free speech. I felt very embarrassed and even ashamed for you, Giovanni and the few who engaged in the debate on liberty and freedom of speech while trying so hard to ignore the white elephant in the room. The white elephant being, obviously, the curtailment of my liberty to participate in political debates and to freely express my opinions.

I could go deeper than this, but since there is a chance that you might harm yourself, I am afraid that it would be irresponsible on my part to do so without my being in the same room as you. Take the time to systematically chew over this and if you need more help treating your anger I will lend you a hand again soon.

As for your request that I freely share with you what I have learned from the course, as long as you are emotionally compromised for one or all of the above reasons it is best you take the time to calm down before venturing beyond your comfort zone to debate serious issues with me. As you know by now, debating me is a hazardous hobby for those who are faint of heart. Furthermore, I am rather busy trying to defend my constitutional rights by appealing my expulsion from the course. Once that is over, I will be more than happy to enlighten you on my way of thinking.

I hope this helps.

Sincerely,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Tue, 30 Jun 2009 21:36:13 +0100

Kevin,

I don't mind hearing you elaborate and I may or may not agree 😊

I think you were very rude in the forums. It is one thing to disagree and state an opinion at the other pole, but another thing altogether to make personal attacks. You made some very personal, unfounded and unnecessary remarks. They went too far. An apology and a return to the political discussions might have allowed the University to leave it be. Having dug yourself a hole, you then jumped in it by making an issue of it !

Anyhow, I am thick skinned and would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you.

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 29 June 2009 02:37
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence.
As for your question, it is not so much that my views have changed, as it is that they have been confirmed. I would love to elaborate, but I don't think you will like to hear what I have to say. You know how outspoken I am and since I don't like to beat around the bush or sugar coat my opinions it is best I keep them to myself. You saw where speaking honestly leads in an environment as inimical to free speech as Oxford.
Anyhow, thank you for taking the time to answer my email. I appreciate it. If there is anything I can do for you let me know.
Hope you had a great camping weekend with the kids. It sounds like great fun.
Take care,
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com

Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Sat, 27 Jun 2009 17:00:08 +0100

Hi Kevin,

Yes, he is real and did reply.

Be interested to know if anything on the course has changed your views. I certainly expected to come out with some changed views.

Can't carry on, under pressure to go - camping with the kids.

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 26 June 2009 07:13
To: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
I would be interested to know if Max ever answered your invitation. The reason I ask is because I have always suspected that Max is Dr. Giovanni's proxy and may not even exist as a real student. I am probably wrong, but I would love to know if that is the case. Can you help?
On a different note, I continue to enjoy your postings. I can do so because I have appealed Giovanni's decision to throw me out of the course and have asked for and was granted access to the forums to prepare my defence. As long as I do not post anything and the appeal, which is now about to go the university's proctors, is ongoing, the department of continuing education had no choice but to grant me access.
Keep up the good work.
Kevin Galalae

Date: Sun, 21 Jun 2009 22:07:13 +0100
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
From: conted.ox@m3w5.demon.co.uk
Subject: politic-phil: Beer

[politic-phil](#) » [Forums](#) » [Common room](#) » [Beer](#)

Beer

by [Ivor Middleton](#) - Monday, 22 June 2009, 02:19 AM

Max,

You must live and work somewhere near me - fancy meeting up for a drink sometime ?
ivor_at_m3w5.demon.co.uk

Ivor

[Reply](#)

[See this post in context](#)

RE: politic-phil: Beer

Von: **kevin galalae** (kgalalae@hotmail.com)

Gesendet: Sonntag, 5. Juli 2009 23:58:27

An: Ivor Middleton (ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk)

Will you stop baiting, Ivor. You are embarrassing yourself. Besides, it is now your turn to tell me what you have learned from the course.

Regards,
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Sun, 5 Jul 2009 20:15:27 +0100

Hi Kevin,

Only got a moment, so will be brief : are you saying that you think it is perfectly ok to make personal attacks on people, as opposed to questioning their arguments (argument in the sense of case or debate) ?

Regards,

Ivor

PS The assignment is long gone (was due last week).

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 05 July 2009 06:18
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,
Read the attachment for help with your assignment.
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Fri, 3 Jul 2009 11:29:29 +0100

Kevin,

I feel no anger so , premise or diagnosis, the case needs to be rethought.

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 02 July 2009 05:46
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,

It's not a premise; it's a diagnosis. Your anger obviously overpowered your sense of propriety, for though I did not solicit your opinion about what happened in the forums you could not contain your anger and had to let it loose on me in a most unseemly manner. You must know that it is very rude to accuse someone of rudeness especially when it is outside the topic of discussion.

Having detected your anger I proceeded to diagnose its cause. You are distorting my attempt at diagnosing your anger as a personal attack on you. If you applied the same distorting criticism to your oncologist, you would accuse him of molesting you for shoving his arm up your arse to ascertain whether the symptoms you display are indeed caused by a malignant tumour that is threatening your life with colon cancer. By the same token, you would call the cops on the nurse who is drawing your blood for necessary lab tests, for you would accuse her of vampirism.

What I did is to merely point out the most probable causes of your anger. If I had been wrong in my diagnosis, you would have no doubt proceeded to set me right on the subject by volunteering the true cause or causes of your anger. But instead you chose to deny that you are angry at all, despite the fact that this is an obvious lie. And bare denial, as we all know, is the natural defence of all those who try to hide the truth. So before we can proceed to philosophical discussions you must at least admit that you are emotionally compromised and tell me why. That way we can set the record straight and pave the way for logical and honest dialogue. Otherwise we would engage each other on false premises and will only end up aggravating each other. Life is too short for aggravation.

It is interesting to note that in re-reading your emails I could not help but stumble upon a different thread. Since I am an honest man who likes to play with all cards on the table, I will reveal to you my revelation.

Your answer to my question whether Max is real and answered your invitation to a beer brought about your reply that "*Yes, he is real and did reply.*" But since you did not meet him for a beer

you have no way of knowing that the person who replied to your email is Max or not. Nevertheless, you declare with great certainty that Max is real. In and of itself there is nothing suspicious in your answer. But the anger that followed my reply ("*Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence.*") is what aroused my suspicion. My answer was obviously not to your liking. Yet the forcefulness with which you expressed your dissatisfaction with my resolve to defend myself goes well beyond what would be appropriate and therefore normal for someone who is uninvolved in the matter. This leads me to believe that you are somehow personally involved. Could it be that you are trying to cover up Max's true identity in order to protect Giovanni? If so, that would mean that you are privy to information that Giovanni would only share with someone he knows well or someone who shares a secret with him. It could also very well be that I have uncovered the axis of conniving that brought about my expulsion from the course.

The suspicion that you are privy to information that only Giovanni has received from me is supported also by your echoing of the language I used in my appeal to the adjudicator to list Gloria's insults directed at me. Revealing is also the fact that you are using the same rationale and language as Giovanni to insinuate that my expulsion from the course is not a case of curtailment of free speech but a case of the right punishment for someone who makes personal attacks on others. When all of the above threads are put together it becomes clear that you and Giovanni have direct contact and that the two of you have exchanged information that a tutor and a student have no reason to exchange unless they are collaborators or, should I say, partners in crime.

If that is the case, you better come clear, Ivor; otherwise Giovanni will lose his job when all this information comes into the hands of the Proctors. And I certainly don't want Giovanni to lose his job. I like Giovanni and think he is a decent guy who made a big mistake in choosing to maliciously deny me credit for the course and for breeching my right to free speech and to expressing my socio-political ideas and ideals without fear of retribution.

Furthermore, anyone with half a brain looking at Max's debate with me will know that the person debating me is not a student but the course's tutor. Giovanni's continuous denial of this fact places him in a very dangerous position.

Let me show you how easy it is to show that Max is Giovanni:

1. Max has only posted twice, for Plato's argument, lesson five, and political experiences, lesson 1. A student as intelligent as Max would not take the course to fail it due to laziness or failure to fulfill the course requirements.
2. Max has a wonderfully clear mind and a keen intellect, which he uses to clarify the

information posted by others in order to bring maximum benefit to the class. A student would not summarize the opponent's points with such selfless clarity or post with the intent to complete the existing discussion.

3. Max's first lengthy posting comes right after Giovanni's intervention in lesson 4, when his defence of utilitarianism in the objections to utilitarianism forum, lesson 4, backfired in that it stifled further debate. Giovanni was obviously trying a new strategy to direct the discussion by posting under an assumed identity.

4. Only Giovanni uses multiple emoticons within a single posting. Max, like Giovanni, uses multiple emoticons.

5. Only a tutor and not a student would be concerned with deviating from the course topic. A student as disinterested in the course as Max would certainly not show this kind of concern.

6. Max Tant has disappeared from the forums as suddenly as he appeared.

7. Max Tant has engaged no one but me.

8. Once I voiced my suspicion to Giovanni about Max's true identity, Max disappeared from the forums entirely.

So you see, my dear Ivor, it is painfully obvious that Max is Giovanni. What is unclear is why Giovanni used Max as a proxy? What is also clear is that the whooping I gave Max in the debate would have certainly upset Giovanni by hurting his pride. As you well know, nobody likes to lose a debate. For a tutor to lose a debate to a student must be especially unbearable. Ergo, Giovanni kicked me out of the course for ulterior motives. Ergo two, in denying that he is behind Max's postings he is allowing himself the right to lie and to call me an anarchist and a communist under an assumed identity while denying me the right to self-defence to Gloria's attempt at scapegoating me for her inability to keep up with the course work.

Well, I am burning to hear your reply.

Cheerio mate,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Wed, 1 Jul 2009 08:29:23 +0100

Hi Kevin,

I feel no anger, so you need to change the basic premiss for what you have written here.

You make some very personal attacks in what you write below, which are based upon conjecture or personal perceptions. It is extraordinarily difficult to ever know what is going on in someone else's head.

Despite this, your statements suggest you have a good idea of what is going on in my head : "boiling", "publicly embarrassed", "tried to sound smart", "full of anger", concerned for my "social position", "intolerance" for other views. These are unfounded and you should not have made them. For example, I would not be discussing with you if I could not tolerate your alternative views.

As said below, I would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you. Personal attacks can wait until you have more grounds ☺

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 01 July 2009 03:23
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,

Since it pains me to see you so full of anger, I will try to help you recover your composure. By the way, thank you for reaching out to me to help you resolve your anger issues.

To help you, however, I am afraid that I will have to bluntly point out the probable underlying causes of your anger; for only by honestly facing them do you stand a chance to

recover. This is a similar approach to psychoanalysis. The sources of your anger are most likely the following conscious or unconscious inner conflicts:

1. You are still boiling over having lost every debate with me and having been at times publicly embarrassed in the process (like when you tried to sound smart by mentioning chaos theory).
2. You are using misdirected anger to mask your intolerance for views critical of the society you live in, and of the ideals you conveniently espouse because they fit your social position.
3. By angrily insisting that my alleged rudeness warrants my exclusion from the course you are trying to hide your lack of courage and inability to live up to the principles you thought you hold dear; in this case, free speech. I felt very embarrassed and even ashamed for you, Giovanni and the few who engaged in the debate on liberty and freedom of speech while trying so hard to ignore the white elephant in the room. The white elephant being, obviously, the curtailment of my liberty to participate in political debates and to freely express my opinions.

I could go deeper than this, but since there is a chance that you might harm yourself, I am afraid that it would be irresponsible on my part to do so without my being in the same room as you. Take the time to systematically chew over this and if you need more help treating your anger I will lend you a hand again soon.

As for your request that I freely share with you what I have learned from the course, as long as you are emotionally compromised for one or all of the above reasons it is best you take the time to calm down before venturing beyond your comfort zone to debate serious issues with me. As you know by now, debating me is a hazardous hobby for those who are faint of heart. Furthermore, I am rather busy trying to defend my constitutional rights by appealing my expulsion from the course. Once that is over, I will be more than happy to enlighten you on my way of thinking.

I hope this helps.

Sincerely,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Tue, 30 Jun 2009 21:36:13 +0100

Kevin,

I don't mind hearing you elaborate and I may or may not agree ☺

I think you were very rude in the forums. It is one thing to disagree and state an opinion at the other pole, but another thing altogether to make personal attacks. You made some very personal, unfounded and unnecessary remarks. They went too far. An apology and a return to the political discussions might have allowed the University to leave it be. Having dug yourself a hole, you then jumped in it by making an issue of it !

Anyhow, I am thick skinned and would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you.

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 29 June 2009 02:37
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence.
As for your question, it is not so much that my views have changed, as it is that they have been confirmed. I would love to elaborate, but I don't think you will like to hear what I

have to say. You know how outspoken I am and since I don't like to beat around the bush or sugar coat my opinions it is best I keep them to myself. You saw where speaking honestly leads in an environment as inimical to free speech as Oxford. Anyhow, thank you for taking the time to answer my email. I appreciate it. If there is anything I can do for you let me know. Hope you had a great camping weekend with the kids. It sounds like great fun. Take care,
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Sat, 27 Jun 2009 17:00:08 +0100

Hi Kevin,

Yes, he is real and did reply.

Be interested to know if anything on the course has changed your views. I certainly expected to come out with some changed views.

Can't carry on, under pressure to go - camping with the kids.

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 26 June 2009 07:13
To: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
I would be interested to know if Max ever answered your invitation. The reason I ask is because I have always suspected that Max is Dr. Giovanni's proxy and may not even exist as a real student. I am probably wrong, but I would love to know if that is the case. Can

you help?

On a different note, I continue to enjoy your postings. I can do so because I have appealed Giovanni's decision to throw me out of the course and have asked for and was granted access to the forums to prepare my defence. As long as I do not post anything and the appeal, which is now about to go the university's proctors, is ongoing, the department of continuing education had no choice but to grant me access.

Keep up the good work.

Kevin Galalae

Date: Sun, 21 Jun 2009 22:07:13 +0100

To: kgalalae@hotmail.com

From: conted.ox@m3w5.demon.co.uk

Subject: politic-phil: Beer

[politic-phil](#) » [Forums](#) » [Common room](#) » [Beer](#)

Beer

by [Ivor Middleton](#) - Monday, 22 June 2009, 02:19 AM

Max,

You must live and work somewhere near me - fancy meeting up for a drink sometime ?
ivor_at_m3w5.demon.co.uk

Ivor

[Reply](#)

[See this post in context](#)

RE: politic-phil: Beer

Von:

kevin galalae (kgalalae@hotmail.com)

Gesendet: Freitag, 24. Juli 2009 14:23:00

An: Ivor Middleton (ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk)

Hi Ivor,

Just a quick note to remind you that I am still waiting to hear what you have learned from the course and that I will be presenting our entire correspondence to the Proctors as evidence of collusion between you and Giovanni.

Cheers,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk

To: kgalalae@hotmail.com

Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Date: Wed, 8 Jul 2009 20:38:46 +0100

Bit busy. Will respond when I get a chance.

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]

Sent: 07 July 2009 12:49

To: Ivor Middleton

Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

I'm still waiting for your brilliance, mate.

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk

To: kgalalae@hotmail.com

Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Date: Sun, 5 Jul 2009 20:15:27 +0100

Hi Kevin,

Only got a moment, so will be brief : are you saying that you think it is perfectly ok to make personal attacks on people, as opposed to questioning their arguments (argument in the sense of case or debate) ?

Regards,

Ivor

PS The assignment is long gone (was due last week).

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 05 July 2009 06:18
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,
Read the attachment for help with your assignment.
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Fri, 3 Jul 2009 11:29:29 +0100

Kevin,

I feel no anger so , premise or diagnosis, the case needs to be rethought.

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 02 July 2009 05:46
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,

It's not a premise; it's a diagnosis. Your anger obviously overpowered your sense of propriety, for though I did not solicit your opinion about what happened in the forums you could not contain your anger and had to let it loose on me in a most unseemly manner. You must know that it is very rude to accuse someone of rudeness especially when it is outside the topic of discussion.

Having detected your anger I proceeded to diagnose its cause. You are distorting my attempt at diagnosing your anger as a personal attack on you. If you applied the same distorting criticism to your oncologist, you would accuse him of molesting you for shoving his arm up your arse to ascertain whether the symptoms you display are indeed caused by a malignant tumour that is threatening your life with colon cancer. By the same token, you would call the cops on the nurse who is drawing your blood for necessary lab tests, for you would accuse her of vampirism.

What I did is to merely point out the most probable causes of your anger. If I had been wrong in my diagnosis, you would have no doubt proceeded to set me right on the subject by volunteering the true cause or causes of your anger. But instead you chose to deny that you are angry at all, despite the fact that this is an obvious lie. And bare denial, as we all know, is the natural defence of all those who try to hide the truth. So before we can proceed to philosophical discussions you must at least admit that you are emotionally compromised and tell me why. That way we can set the record straight and pave the way for logical and honest dialogue. Otherwise we would engage each other on false premises and will only end up aggravating each other. Life is too short for aggravation.

It is interesting to note that in re-reading your emails I could not help but stumble upon a different thread. Since I am an honest man who likes to play with all cards on the table, I will reveal to you my revelation.

Your answer to my question whether Max is real and answered your invitation to a beer brought about your reply that *"Yes, he is real and did reply."* But since you did not meet him for a beer you have no way of knowing that the person who replied to your email is Max or not. Nevertheless, you declare with great certainty that Max is real. In and of itself there is nothing suspicious in your answer. But the anger that followed my reply (*"Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence."*) is what aroused my suspicion. My answer was obviously not to your liking. Yet the forcefulness with which you expressed your dissatisfaction with my resolve to defend myself goes well beyond what would be appropriate and therefore normal for someone who is uninvolved in the matter. This leads me to believe that you are somehow personally involved. Could it be that you are trying to cover up Max's true identity in order to protect Giovanni? If so, that would mean that you are privy to information that Giovanni would only share with someone he knows well or someone who shares a secret with him. It could also very well be that I have uncovered the axis of conniving that brought about my expulsion from the course.

The suspicion that you are privy to information that only Giovanni has received from me is supported also by your echoing of the language I used in my appeal to the adjudicator to list Gloria's insults directed at me. Revealing is also the fact that you are using the same rationale and language as Giovanni to insinuate that my expulsion from the course is not a case of curtailment of free speech but a case of the right punishment for someone who makes personal attacks on others. When all of the above threads are put together it becomes clear that you and Giovanni have direct contact and that the two of you have exchanged information that a tutor and a student have no reason to exchange unless they are collaborators or, should I say, partners in crime.

If that is the case, you better come clear, Ivor; otherwise Giovanni will lose his job when all this information comes into the hands of the Proctors. And I certainly don't want Giovanni to lose his job. I like Giovanni and think he is a decent guy who made a big mistake in choosing to maliciously deny me credit for the course and for breaching my right to free speech and to expressing my socio-political ideas and ideals without fear of retribution.

Furthermore, anyone with half a brain looking at Max's debate with me will know that the person debating me is not a student but the course's tutor. Giovanni's continuous denial of this fact places him in a very dangerous position.

Let me show you how easy it is to show that Max is Giovanni:

1. Max has only posted twice, for Plato's argument, lesson five, and political experiences, lesson 1. A student as intelligent as Max would not take the course to fail it due to laziness or failure to fulfill the course requirements.
2. Max has a wonderfully clear mind and a keen intellect, which he uses to clarify the information posted by others in order to bring maximum benefit to the class. A student would not summarize the opponent's points with such selfless clarity or post with the intent to complete the existing discussion.
3. Max's first lengthy posting comes right after Giovanni's intervention in lesson 4, when his defence of utilitarianism in the objections to utilitarianism forum, lesson 4, backfired in that it stifled further debate. Giovanni was obviously trying a new strategy to direct the discussion by posting under an assumed identity.
4. Only Giovanni uses multiple emoticons within a single posting. Max, like Giovanni, uses multiple emoticons.
5. Only a tutor and not a student would be concerned with deviating from the course topic. A student as disinterested in the course as Max would certainly not show this kind of concern.

6. Max Tant has disappeared from the forums as suddenly as he appeared.
7. Max Tant has engaged no one but me.
8. Once I voiced my suspicion to Giovanni about Max's true identity, Max disappeared from the forums entirely.

So you see, my dear Ivor, it is painfully obvious that Max is Giovanni. What is unclear is why Giovanni used Max as a proxy? What is also clear is that the whooping I gave Max in the debate would have certainly upset Giovanni by hurting his pride. As you well know, nobody likes to lose a debate. For a tutor to lose a debate to a student must be especially unbearable. Ergo, Giovanni kicked me out of the course for ulterior motives. Ergo two, in denying that he is behind Max's postings he is allowing himself the right to lie and to call me an anarchist and a communist under an assumed identity while denying me the right to self-defence to Gloria's attempt at scapegoating me for her inability to keep up with the course work.

Well, I am burning to hear your reply.

Cheerio mate,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Wed, 1 Jul 2009 08:29:23 +0100

Hi Kevin,

I feel no anger, so you need to change the basic premiss for what you have written here.

You make some very personal attacks in what you write below, which are based upon conjecture or personal perceptions. It is extraordinarily difficult to ever know what is going on in someone else's head. Despite this, your statements suggest you have a good idea of what is going on in my head: "boiling", "publicly embarrassed", "tried to sound smart", "full of anger", concerned for my "social position", "intolerance" for other views. These are unfounded and you should not have made them. For example, I would not be discussing with you if I could not tolerate your alternative views.

As said below, I would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you. Personal attacks can wait until you have more grounds ☺

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 01 July 2009 03:23
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,

Since it pains me to see you so full of anger, I will try to help you recover your composure. By the way, thank you for reaching out to me to help you resolve your anger issues.

To help you, however, I am afraid that I will have to bluntly point out the probable underlying causes of your anger; for only by honestly facing them do you stand a chance to recover. This is a similar approach to psychoanalysis. The sources of your anger are most likely the following conscious or unconscious inner conflicts:

1. You are still boiling over having lost every debate with me and having been at times publicly embarrassed in the process (like when you tried to sound smart by mentioning chaos theory).
2. You are using misdirected anger to mask your intolerance for views critical of the society you live in, and of the ideals you conveniently espouse because they fit your social position.
3. By angrily insisting that my alleged rudeness warrants my exclusion from the course you are trying to hide your lack of courage and inability to live up to the principles you thought you hold dear; in this case, free speech. I felt very embarrassed and even ashamed for you, Giovanni and the few who engaged in the debate on liberty and freedom of speech while trying so hard to ignore the white elephant in the room.

The white elephant being, obviously, the curtailment of my liberty to participate in political debates and to freely express my opinions.

I could go deeper than this, but since there is a chance that you might harm yourself, I am afraid that it would be irresponsible on my part to do so without my being in the same room as you. Take the time to systematically chew over this and if you need more help treating your anger I will lend you a hand again soon.

As for your request that I freely share with you what I have learned from the course, as long as you are emotionally compromised for one or all of the above reasons it is best you take the time to calm down before venturing beyond your comfort zone to debate serious issues with me. As you know by now, debating me is a hazardous hobby for those who are faint of heart. Furthermore, I am rather busy trying to defend my constitutional rights by appealing my expulsion from the course. Once that is over, I will be more than happy to enlighten you on my way of thinking.

I hope this helps.

Sincerely,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Tue, 30 Jun 2009 21:36:13 +0100

Kevin,

I don't mind hearing you elaborate and I may or may not agree ☺

I think you were very rude in the forums. It is one thing to disagree and state an opinion at the other pole, but another thing altogether to make personal attacks. You made some very personal, unfounded and unnecessary remarks. They went too far. An apology and a return to the political discussions might have allowed the University to leave it be. Having dug yourself a hole, you then jumped in it by making an issue of it !

Anyhow, I am thick skinned and would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you.

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 29 June 2009 02:37
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence.
As for your question, it is not so much that my views have changed, as it is that they have been confirmed. I would love to elaborate, but I don't think you will like to hear what I have to say. You know how outspoken I am and since I don't like to beat around the bush or sugar coat my opinions it is best I keep them to myself. You saw where speaking honestly leads in an environment as inimical to free speech as Oxford.
Anyhow, thank you for taking the time to answer my email. I appreciate it. If there is anything I can do for you let me know.
Hope you had a great camping weekend with the kids. It sounds like great fun.
Take care,
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Sat, 27 Jun 2009 17:00:08 +0100

Hi Kevin,

Yes, he is real and did reply.

Be interested to know if anything on the course has changed your views. I certainly expected to come out with some changed views.

Can't carry on, under pressure to go - camping with the kids.

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]

Sent: 26 June 2009 07:13

To: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk

Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,

I would be interested to know if Max ever answered your invitation. The reason I ask is because I have always suspected that Max is Dr. Giovanni's proxy and may not even exist as a real student. I am probably wrong, but I would love to know if that is the case. Can you help?

On a different note, I continue to enjoy your postings. I can do so because I have appealed Giovanni's decision to throw me out of the course and have asked for and was granted access to the forums to prepare my defence. As long as I do not post anything and the appeal, which is now about to go the university's proctors, is ongoing, the department of continuing education had no choice but to grant me access.

Keep up the good work.

Kevin Galalae

Date: Sun, 21 Jun 2009 22:07:13 +0100

To: kgalalae@hotmail.com

From: conted.ox@m3w5.demon.co.uk

Subject: politic-phil: Beer

[politic-phil](#) » [Forums](#) » [Common room](#) » [Beer](#)

Beer

by [Ivor Middleton](#) - Monday, 22 June 2009, 02:19 AM

Max,

You must live and work somewhere near me - fancy meeting up for a drink sometime ?
ivor_at_m3w5.demon.co.uk

Ivor

[Reply](#)

[See this post in context](#)

RE: politic-phil: Beer

Von: **kevin galalae** (kgalalae@hotmail.com)

Gesendet: Donnerstag, 30. Juli 2009 04:26:23

An: Ivor Middleton (ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk)

What conversation, Ivor? This is the first time you have actually contributed anything to our supposed conversation. Until now I have been carrying a monologue. Talk about tedious! Having said that, I am glad you have finally decided to open up a little bit. I would like to comment on your points about what you have taken from the course, but time constraints prevent me from doing this at this time. I will do so as soon as I can free some time. For the time being, the Proctors have priority.

Regards,

Kevin

P.S. Given your views on religion and climate change, you must like my thesis proposal. Care to make any observations that might help me refine it?

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Wed, 29 Jul 2009 12:33:41 +0100

Kevin,

Believe what you want. You are jumping to conclusions and making unfounded allegations. This makes conversation tedious.

The main thing I got out of the course was getting to do lots of focused reading and thinking, instead of tinkering with this book and that and not actually writing anything or organising and reinforcing my thoughts. The intensity of it was great. I really miss it now. There are lots of areas of political philosophy I now want to go into in greater depth.

I also want to do some work on ethics and morality, particularly as I see pol phil as sitting inside them.

It was interesting to note that all the great thinkers had their flaws. I wasn't greatly impressed by the 20C ones, which surprised me. Looking forward to reading some more and writing it up.

I don't think my views have changed. I'm more aware of some of the problems of democracy, but also more aware of what I don't know ! My views on religion have hardened a little – it really is the greatest danger to civilisation on the planet (well, second to climate change).

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 28 July 2009 05:00
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

I want to believe you, Ivor. Unfortunately, the evidence and your reluctance to volunteer facts point in the other direction. Nevertheless, you have the opportunity to tell the truth. Use it.

Cheers,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Mon, 27 Jul 2009 21:49:52 +0100

Kevin,

Still a bit busy. You sound a bit paranoid ? I have never met Giovanni.

Cheers,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 24 July 2009 13:23
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
Just a quick note to remind you that I am still waiting to hear what you have learned from the course and that I will be presenting our entire correspondence to the Proctors as evidence of collusion between you and Giovanni.
Cheers,
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Wed, 8 Jul 2009 20:38:46 +0100

Bit busy. Will respond when I get a chance.

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 07 July 2009 12:49
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

I'm still waiting for your brilliance, mate.
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Sun, 5 Jul 2009 20:15:27 +0100

Hi Kevin,

Only got a moment, so will be brief : are you saying that you think it is perfectly ok to make personl attacks on people, as opposed to questioning their arguments (argument in the sense of case or debate) ?

Regards,

Ivor

PS The assignment is long gone (was due last week).

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 05 July 2009 06:18
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,
Read the attachment for help with your assignment.
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Fri, 3 Jul 2009 11:29:29 +0100

Kevin,

I feel no anger so , premise or diagnosis, the case needs to be rethought.

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 02 July 2009 05:46
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,

It's not a premise; it's a diagnosis. Your anger obviously overpowered your sense of propriety, for though I did not solicit your opinion about what happened in the forums you could not contain your anger and had to let it loose on me in a most unseemly manner. You must know that it is very rude to accuse someone of rudeness especially when it is outside the topic of discussion.

Having detected your anger I proceeded to diagnose its cause. You are distorting my attempt at diagnosing your anger as a personal attack on you. If you applied the same distorting criticism to your oncologist, you would accuse him of molesting you for shoving his arm up your arse to ascertain whether the symptoms you display are indeed caused by a malignant tumour that is threatening your life with colon cancer. By the same token, you would call the cops on the nurse who is drawing your blood for necessary lab tests, for you would accuse her of vampirism.

What I did is to merely point out the most probable causes of your anger. If I had been wrong in my diagnosis, you would have no doubt proceeded to set me right on the subject by volunteering the true cause or causes of your anger. But instead you chose to deny that you are angry at all, despite the fact that this is an obvious lie. And bare denial, as we all know, is the natural defence of all those who try to hide the truth. So before we can proceed to philosophical discussions you must at least admit that you are emotionally compromised and tell me why. That way we can set the record straight and pave the way for logical and honest dialogue. Otherwise we would engage each other on false premises and will only end up aggravating each other. Life is too short for aggravation.

It is interesting to note that in re-reading your emails I could not help but stumble upon a different thread. Since I am an honest man who likes to play with all cards on the table, I will reveal to you my revelation.

Your answer to my question whether Max is real and answered your invitation to a beer brought about your reply that *"Yes, he is real and did reply."* But since you did not meet him for a beer you have no way of knowing that the person who replied to your email is Max or not. Nevertheless, you declare with great certainty that Max is real. In and of itself there is nothing suspicious in your answer. But the anger that followed my reply (*"Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence."*) is what aroused my suspicion. My answer was obviously not to your liking. Yet the forcefulness with which you expressed your dissatisfaction with my resolve to defend myself goes well beyond what would be appropriate and therefore normal for someone who is uninvolved in the matter. This leads me to believe that you are somehow personally involved. Could it be that you are trying to cover up Max's true identity in order to protect Giovanni? If so, that would mean that you are privy to information that Giovanni would only share with someone he knows well or someone who shares a secret with him. It could also very well be that I have uncovered the axis of conniving that brought about my expulsion from the course.

The suspicion that you are privy to information that only Giovanni has received from me is supported also by your echoing of the language I used in my appeal to the adjudicator to list Gloria's insults directed at me. Revealing is also the fact that you are using the same rationale and language as Giovanni to insinuate that my expulsion from the course is not a case of curtailment of free speech but a case of the right punishment for someone who makes personal attacks on others. When all of the above threads are put together it becomes clear that you and

Giovanni have direct contact and that the two of you have exchanged information that a tutor and a student have no reason to exchange unless they are collaborators or, should I say, partners in crime.

If that is the case, you better come clear, Ivor; otherwise Giovanni will lose his job when all this information comes into the hands of the Proctors. And I certainly don't want Giovanni to lose his job. I like Giovanni and think he is a decent guy who made a big mistake in choosing to maliciously deny me credit for the course and for breaching my right to free speech and to expressing my socio-political ideas and ideals without fear of retribution.

Furthermore, anyone with half a brain looking at Max's debate with me will know that the person debating me is not a student but the course's tutor. Giovanni's continuous denial of this fact places him in a very dangerous position.

Let me show you how easy it is to show that Max is Giovanni:

1. Max has only posted twice, for Plato's argument, lesson five, and political experiences, lesson 1. A student as intelligent as Max would not take the course to fail it due to laziness or failure to fulfill the course requirements.
2. Max has a wonderfully clear mind and a keen intellect, which he uses to clarify the information posted by others in order to bring maximum benefit to the class. A student would not summarize the opponent's points with such selfless clarity or post with the intent to complete the existing discussion.
3. Max's first lengthy posting comes right after Giovanni's intervention in lesson 4, when his defence of utilitarianism in the objections to utilitarianism forum, lesson 4, backfired in that it stifled further debate. Giovanni was obviously trying a new strategy to direct the discussion by posting under an assumed identity.
4. Only Giovanni uses multiple emoticons within a single posting. Max, like Giovanni, uses multiple emoticons.
5. Only a tutor and not a student would be concerned with deviating from the course topic. A student as disinterested in the course as Max would certainly not show this kind of concern.
6. Max Tant has disappeared from the forums as suddenly as he appeared.
7. Max Tant has engaged no one but me.
8. Once I voiced my suspicion to Giovanni about Max's true identity, Max disappeared from the forums entirely.

So you see, my dear Ivor, it is painfully obvious that Max is Giovanni. What is unclear is why Giovanni used Max as a proxy? What is also clear is that the whooping I gave Max in the debate would have certainly upset Giovanni by hurting his pride. As you well know, nobody likes to lose a debate. For a tutor to lose a debate to a student must be especially unbearable. Ergo, Giovanni kicked me out of the course for ulterior motives. Ergo two, in denying that he is behind Max's postings he is allowing himself the right to lie and to call me an anarchist and a communist under an assumed identity while denying me the right to self-defence to Gloria's attempt at scapegoating me for her inability to keep up with the course work.

Well, I am burning to hear your reply.

Cheerio mate,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Wed, 1 Jul 2009 08:29:23 +0100

Hi Kevin,

I feel no anger, so you need to change the basic premiss for what you have written here.

You make some very personal attacks in what you write below, which are based upon conjecture or personal perceptions. It is extraordinarily difficult to ever know what is going on in someone else's head. Despite this, your statements suggest you have a good idea of what is going on in my head : "boiling", "publicly embarrassed", "tried to sound smart", "full of anger", concerned for my "social position", "intolerance" for other views. These are unfounded and you should not have made them. For example, I would not be discussing with you if I could not tolerate your alternative views.

As said below, I would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you. Personal attacks can wait until you have more grounds ☺

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 01 July 2009 03:23
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,

Since it pains me to see you so full of anger, I will try to help you recover your composure. By the way, thank you for reaching out to me to help you resolve your anger issues.

To help you, however, I am afraid that I will have to bluntly point out the probable underlying causes of your anger; for only by honestly facing them do you stand a chance to recover. This is a similar approach to psychoanalysis. The sources of your anger are most likely the following conscious or unconscious inner conflicts:

1. You are still boiling over having lost every debate with me and having been at times publicly embarrassed in the process (like when you tried to sound smart by mentioning chaos theory).
2. You are using misdirected anger to mask your intolerance for views critical of the society you live in, and of the ideals you conveniently espouse because they fit your social position.
3. By angrily insisting that my alleged rudeness warrants my exclusion from the course you are trying to hide your lack of courage and inability to live up to the principles you thought you hold dear; in this case, free speech. I felt very embarrassed and even ashamed for you, Giovanni and the few who engaged in the debate on liberty and freedom of speech while trying so hard to ignore the white elephant in the room. The white elephant being, obviously, the curtailment of my liberty to participate in political debates and to freely express my opinions.

I could go deeper than this, but since there is a chance that you might harm yourself, I am afraid that it would be irresponsible on my part to do so without my being in the same room as you. Take the time to systematically chew over this and if you need more help treating your anger I will lend you a hand again soon.

As for your request that I freely share with you what I have learned from the course, as long as you are emotionally compromised for one or all of the above reasons it is best you take the time to calm down before venturing beyond your comfort zone to debate serious issues with me. As you know by now, debating me is a hazardous hobby for those who are faint of heart. Furthermore, I am rather busy trying to defend my constitutional rights by appealing my expulsion from the course. Once that is over, I will be more than happy to enlighten you on my way of thinking.

I hope this helps.

Sincerely,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Tue, 30 Jun 2009 21:36:13 +0100

Kevin,

I don't mind hearing you elaborate and I may or may not agree ☺

I think you were very rude in the forums. It is one thing to disagree and state an opinion at the other pole, but another thing altogether to make personal attacks. You made some very personal, unfounded and unnecessary remarks. They went too far. An apology and a return to the political discussions might have allowed the University to leave it be. Having dug yourself a hole, you then jumped in it by making an issue of it !

Anyhow, I am thick skinned and would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you.

Regards,

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 29 June 2009 02:37
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence.
As for your question, it is not so much that my views have changed, as it is that they have been confirmed. I would love to elaborate, but I don't think you will like to hear what I have to say. You know how outspoken I am and since I don't like to beat around the bush or sugar coat my opinions it is best I keep them to myself. You saw where speaking honestly leads in an environment as inimical to free speech as Oxford.
Anyhow, thank you for taking the time to answer my email. I appreciate it. If there is anything I can do for you let me know.
Hope you had a great camping weekend with the kids. It sounds like great fun.
Take care,
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Sat, 27 Jun 2009 17:00:08 +0100

Hi Kevin,

Yes, he is real and did reply.

Be interested to know if anything on the course has changed your views. I certainly expected to come out with some changed views.

Can't carry on, under pressure to go - camping with the kids.

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 26 June 2009 07:13
To: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
I would be interested to know if Max ever answered your invitation. The reason I ask is because I have always suspected that Max is Dr. Giovanni's proxy and may not even exist as a real student. I am probably wrong, but I would love to know if that is the case. Can you help?
On a different note, I continue to enjoy your postings. I can do so because I have appealed Giovanni's decision to throw me out of the course and have asked for and was granted access to the forums to prepare my defence. As long as I do not post anything and the appeal, which is now about to go the university's proctors, is ongoing, the department of continuing education had no choice but to grant me access.
Keep up the good work.
Kevin Galalae

Date: Sun, 21 Jun 2009 22:07:13 +0100
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
From: conted.ox@m3w5.demon.co.uk
Subject: politic-phil: Beer

[politic-phil](#) » [Forums](#) » [Common room](#) » [Beer](#)

Beer

by [Ivor Middleton](#) - Monday, 22 June 2009, 02:19 AM

Max,

You must live and work somewhere near me - fancy meeting up for a drink sometime ?
ivor _at_ m3w5.demon.co.uk

Ivor

[Reply](#)

[See this post in context](#)

RE: politic-phil: Beer

Von:

Ivor (ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk)

Gesendet: Mittwoch, 29. Juli 2009 13:33:50

An: 'kevin galalae' (kgalalae@hotmail.com)

Kevin,

Believe what you want. You are jumping to conclusions and making unfounded allegations. This makes conversation tedious.

The main thing I got out of the course was getting to do lots of focused reading and thinking, instead of tinkering with this book and that and not actually writing anything or organising and reinforcing my thoughts. The intensity of it was great. I really miss it now. There are lots of areas of political philosophy I now want to go into in greater depth.

I also want to do some work on ethics and morality, particularly as I see pol phil as sitting inside them.

It was interesting to note that all the great thinkers had their flaws. I wasn't greatly impressed by the 20C ones, which surprised me. Looking forward to reading some more and writing it up.

I don't think my views have changed. I'm more aware of some of the problems of democracy, but also more aware of what I don't know ! My views on religion have hardened a little – it really is the greatest danger to civilisation on the planet (well, second to climate change).

Regards,
Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]

Sent: 28 July 2009 05:00

To: Ivor Middleton

Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

I want to believe you, Ivor. Unfortunately, the evidence and your reluctance to volunteer facts point in the other direction. Nevertheless, you have the opportunity to tell the truth. Use it.

Cheers,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Mon, 27 Jul 2009 21:49:52 +0100

Kevin,

Still a bit busy. You sound a bit paranoid ? I have never met Giovanni.

Cheers,
Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 24 July 2009 13:23
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
Just a quick note to remind you that I am still waiting to hear what you have learned from the course and that I will be presenting our entire correspondence to the Proctors as evidence of collusion between you and Giovanni.
Cheers,
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Wed, 8 Jul 2009 20:38:46 +0100

Bit busy. Will respond when I get a chance.

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 07 July 2009 12:49
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

I'm still waiting for your brilliance, mate.
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Sun, 5 Jul 2009 20:15:27 +0100

Hi Kevin,

Only got a moment, so will be brief : are you saying that you think it is perfectly ok to make personl attacks on people, as opposed to questioning their arguments (argument in the sense of case or debate) ?

Regards,
Ivor

PS The assignment is long gone (was due last week).

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 05 July 2009 06:18
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,
Read the attachment for help with your assignment.
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Fri, 3 Jul 2009 11:29:29 +0100

Kevin,

I feel no anger so , premise or diagnosis, the case needs to be rethought.

Regards,
Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 02 July 2009 05:46
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,

It's not a premise; it's a diagnosis. Your anger obviously overpowered your sense of propriety, for though I did not solicit your opinion about what happened in the forums you could not

contain your anger and had to let it loose on me in a most unseemly manner. You must know that it is very rude to accuse someone of rudeness especially when it is outside the topic of discussion.

Having detected your anger I proceeded to diagnose its cause. You are distorting my attempt at diagnosing your anger as a personal attack on you. If you applied the same distorting criticism to your oncologist, you would accuse him of molesting you for shoving his arm up your arse to ascertain whether the symptoms you display are indeed caused by a malignant tumour that is threatening your life with colon cancer. By the same token, you would call the cops on the nurse who is drawing your blood for necessary lab tests, for you would accuse her of vampirism.

What I did is to merely point out the most probable causes of your anger. If I had been wrong in my diagnosis, you would have no doubt proceeded to set me right on the subject by volunteering the true cause or causes of your anger. But instead you chose to deny that you are angry at all, despite the fact that this is an obvious lie. And bare denial, as we all know, is the natural defence of all those who try to hide the truth. So before we can proceed to philosophical discussions you must at least admit that you are emotionally compromised and tell me why. That way we can set the record straight and pave the way for logical and honest dialogue. Otherwise we would engage each other on false premises and will only end up aggravating each other. Life is too short for aggravation.

It is interesting to note that in re-reading your emails I could not help but stumble upon a different thread. Since I am an honest man who likes to play with all cards on the table, I will reveal to you my revelation.

Your answer to my question whether Max is real and answered your invitation to a beer brought about your reply that *"Yes, he is real and did reply."* But since you did not meet him for a beer you have no way of knowing that the person who replied to your email is Max or not. Nevertheless, you declare with great certainty that Max is real. In and of itself there is nothing suspicious in your answer. But the anger that followed my reply (*"Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence."*) is what aroused my suspicion. My answer was obviously not to your liking. Yet the forcefulness with which you expressed your dissatisfaction with my resolve to defend myself goes well beyond what would be appropriate and therefore normal for someone who is uninvolved in the matter. This leads me to believe that you are somehow personally involved. Could it be that you are trying to cover up Max's true identity in order to protect Giovanni? If so, that would mean that you are privy to information that Giovanni would only share with someone he knows well or someone who shares a secret with him. It could also very well be that I have uncovered the axis of conniving that brought about my expulsion from the course.

The suspicion that you are privy to information that only Giovanni has received from me is supported also by your echoing of the language I used in my appeal to the adjudicator to list Gloria's insults directed at me. Revealing is also the fact that you are using the same rationale

and language as Giovanni to insinuate that my expulsion from the course is not a case of curtailment of free speech but a case of the right punishment for someone who makes personal attacks on others. When all of the above threads are put together it becomes clear that you and Giovanni have direct contact and that the two of you have exchanged information that a tutor and a student have no reason to exchange unless they are collaborators or, should I say, partners in crime.

If that is the case, you better come clear, Ivor; otherwise Giovanni will lose his job when all this information comes into the hands of the Proctors. And I certainly don't want Giovanni to lose his job. I like Giovanni and think he is a decent guy who made a big mistake in choosing to maliciously deny me credit for the course and for breeching my right to free speech and to expressing my socio-political ideas and ideals without fear of retribution.

Furthermore, anyone with half a brain looking at Max's debate with me will know that the person debating me is not a student but the course's tutor. Giovanni's continuous denial of this fact places him in a very dangerous position.

Let me show you how easy it is to show that Max is Giovanni:

1. Max has only posted twice, for Plato's argument, lesson five, and political experiences, lesson 1. A student as intelligent as Max would not take the course to fail it due to laziness or failure to fulfill the course requirements.
2. Max has a wonderfully clear mind and a keen intellect, which he uses to clarify the information posted by others in order to bring maximum benefit to the class. A student would not summarize the opponent's points with such selfless clarity or post with the intent to complete the existing discussion.
3. Max's first lengthy posting comes right after Giovanni's intervention in lesson 4, when his defence of utilitarianism in the objections to utilitarianism forum, lesson 4, backfired in that it stifled further debate. Giovanni was obviously trying a new strategy to direct the discussion by posting under an assumed identity.
4. Only Giovanni uses multiple emoticons within a single posting. Max, like Giovanni, uses multiple emoticons.
5. Only a tutor and not a student would be concerned with deviating from the course topic. A student as disinterested in the course as Max would certainly not show this kind of concern.
6. Max Tant has disappeared from the forums as suddenly as he appeared.
7. Max Tant has engaged no one but me.

8. Once I voiced my suspicion to Giovanni about Max's true identity, Max disappeared from the forums entirely.

So you see, my dear Ivor, it is painfully obvious that Max is Giovanni. What is unclear is why Giovanni used Max as a proxy? What is also clear is that the whooping I gave Max in the debate would have certainly upset Giovanni by hurting his pride. As you well know, nobody likes to lose a debate. For a tutor to lose a debate to a student must be especially unbearable. Ergo, Giovanni kicked me out of the course for ulterior motives. Ergo two, in denying that he is behind Max's postings he is allowing himself the right to lie and to call me an anarchist and a communist under an assumed identity while denying me the right to self-defence to Gloria's attempt at scapegoating me for her inability to keep up with the course work.

Well, I am burning to hear your reply.

Cheerio mate,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Wed, 1 Jul 2009 08:29:23 +0100

Hi Kevin,

I feel no anger, so you need to change the basic premiss for what you have written here.

You make some very personal attacks in what you write below, which are based upon conjecture or personal perceptions. It is extraordinarily difficult to ever know what is going on in someone else's head. Despite this, your statements suggest you have a good idea of what is going on in my head: "boiling", "publicly embarrassed", "tried to sound smart", "full of anger", concerned for my "social position", "intolerance" for other views. These are unfounded and you should not have made them. For example, I would not be discussing with you if I could not tolerate your alternative views.

As said below, I would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you. Personal attacks can wait until you have more grounds ☺

Regards,
Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 01 July 2009 03:23

To: Ivor Middleton

Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Dear Ivor,

Since it pains me to see you so full of anger, I will try to help you recover your composure. By the way, thank you for reaching out to me to help you resolve your anger issues.

To help you, however, I am afraid that I will have to bluntly point out the probable underlying causes of your anger; for only by honestly facing them do you stand a chance to recover. This is a similar approach to psychoanalysis. The sources of your anger are most likely the following conscious or unconscious inner conflicts:

1. You are still boiling over having lost every debate with me and having been at times publicly embarrassed in the process (like when you tried to sound smart by mentioning chaos theory).
2. You are using misdirected anger to mask your intolerance for views critical of the society you live in, and of the ideals you conveniently espouse because they fit your social position.
3. By angrily insisting that my alleged rudeness warrants my exclusion from the course you are trying to hide your lack of courage and inability to live up to the principles you thought you hold dear; in this case, free speech. I felt very embarrassed and even ashamed for you, Giovanni and the few who engaged in the debate on liberty and freedom of speech while trying so hard to ignore the white elephant in the room. The white elephant being, obviously, the curtailment of my liberty to participate in political debates and to freely express my opinions.

I could go deeper than this, but since there is a chance that you might harm yourself, I am afraid that it would be irresponsible on my part to do so without my being in the same room as you. Take the time to systematically chew over this and if you need more help treating your anger I will lend you a hand again soon.

As for your request that I freely share with you what I have learned from the course, as long as you are emotionally compromised for one or all of the above reasons it is best you take the time to calm down before venturing beyond your comfort zone to debate serious issues with me. As you know by now, debating me is a hazardous hobby for those who are faint of heart. Furthermore, I am rather busy trying to defend my constitutional rights by appealing my expulsion from the course. Once that is over, I will be more than happy to enlighten you on my way of thinking.

I hope this helps.

Sincerely,

Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Tue, 30 Jun 2009 21:36:13 +0100

Kevin,

I don't mind hearing you elaborate and I may or may not agree ☺

I think you were very rude in the forums. It is one thing to disagree and state an opinion at the other pole, but another thing altogether to make personal attacks. You made some very personal, unfounded and unnecessary remarks. They went too far. An apology and a return to the political discussions might have allowed the University to leave it be. Having dug yourself a hole, you then jumped in it by making an issue of it !

Anyhow, I am thick skinned and would be happy to discuss and debate political philosophy views with you.

Regards,
Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 29 June 2009 02:37
To: Ivor Middleton
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,
Glad to hear Max is real. That way I will be able to call him as a witness in front of the Proctors; a privilege I am allowed as part of my defence.
As for your question, it is not so much that my views have changed, as it is that they have been confirmed. I would love to elaborate, but I don't think you will like to hear what I have to say. You know how outspoken I am and since I don't like to beat around the bush or sugar coat my opinions it is best I keep them to myself. You saw where speaking honestly leads in an environment as inimical to free speech as Oxford.
Anyhow, thank you for taking the time to answer my email. I appreciate it. If there is anything I can do for you let me know.
Hope you had a great camping weekend with the kids. It sounds like great fun.
Take care,
Kevin

From: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com

Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer
Date: Sat, 27 Jun 2009 17:00:08 +0100

Hi Kevin,

Yes, he is real and did reply.

Be interested to know if anything on the course has changed your views. I certainly expected to come out with some changed views.

Can't carry on, under pressure to go - camping with the kids.

Ivor

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 26 June 2009 07:13
To: ivor@m3w5.demon.co.uk
Subject: RE: politic-phil: Beer

Hi Ivor,

I would be interested to know if Max ever answered your invitation. The reason I ask is because I have always suspected that Max is Dr. Giovanni's proxy and may not even exist as a real student. I am probably wrong, but I would love to know if that is the case. Can you help?

On a different note, I continue to enjoy your postings. I can do so because I have appealed Giovanni's decision to throw me out of the course and have asked for and was granted access to the forums to prepare my defence. As long as I do not post anything and the appeal, which is now about to go the university's proctors, is ongoing, the department of continuing education had no choice but to grant me access.

Keep up the good work.

Kevin Galalae

Date: Sun, 21 Jun 2009 22:07:13 +0100
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
From: conted.ox@m3w5.demon.co.uk
Subject: politic-phil: Beer

[politic-phil](#) » [Forums](#) » [Common room](#) » [Beer](#)

Beer

by [Ivor Middleton](#) - Monday, 22 June 2009, 02:19 AM

Max,

You must live and work somewhere near me - fancy meeting up for a drink sometime ?
ivor_at_m3w5.demon.co.uk

Ivor

[Reply](#)

[See this post in context](#)
